

ETPL Meeting
January 22, 2004
10:00 – 3:00
DTR – 5th Floor conference room

Attendees: Kim Dutton – DTR; Bradlee Burtner – DTR; Sharon Britton – DTR (afternoon); Daryl McGaha and Beverly Selby – Lake Cumberlands; Jennifer Compton and Lori Collins – Bluegrass; Ann McGlone – Northern Kentucky (morning); Tonya Mudd – Barren River; Craig Holloman – Purchase/Pennyrite; Latricia Swope – Greater Louisville; Denise Dials – TENCO; Deb Williams – EKCEP; Tonya Logsdon – Green River; and Jackie Masterson – Lincoln Trail

****DTR staff discussed the new process by which the DTR ETPL website will be updated.** A handout (provided by Sandy Gregory, DTR) was distributed to the group outlining the new process. Staff indicated that they hope to make more frequent website updates than have been made in the past. The group was agreeable to monthly updates. Further, they agreed to provide the update transmission even if their data remained unchanged.

****DTR staff discussed re-authorization.** The group was told that the inception of re-authorization is unknown; but it is 'on-the-horizon'. The group was also told that preliminary discussions and research suggest that ETPL policies will be at the discretion of the States, and if a state policy is imminent, DTR will look to LWIA's for input.

****The group discussed differences and similarities in LWIB ETPL policies.** Each area representative was asked to summarize ETPL operations in their LWIA. Some of the highlights follow:

Purchase/Pennyrite - They review applications only three times throughout the year and have been requesting subsequent eligibility applications.

Lake Cumberlands - They have begun using the State's negotiated rates for performance for providers as part of LWIA policy. Initial eligibility applications are approved by the LWIB. They have not been asking for subsequent eligibility applications but have been asking for updated pricing information on a regular basis.

Lincoln Trail - The LWIB has granted staff the authority to approve initial eligibility applications. Subsequent eligibility applications are being requested.

TENCO - Per LWIB policy, all programs of providers receiving HEA funds are approved 'automatically' and do not have to be formally approved (at a LWIB meeting) by the LWIB. However, 'other' programs (of providers not receiving HEA funds) must be formally approved by the LWIB. They are requesting subsequent eligibility applications.

Green River - They have not been requesting subsequent eligibility applications, but they have been requesting updated pricing information on a regular basis.

Greater Louisville - Initial eligibility applications are reviewed by a sub-committee of the LWIB and then recommended by the sub-committee to the LWIB for approval. They have not been requesting subsequent eligibility applications.

Northern Kentucky - The LWIB has granted staff the authority to approve initial eligibility applications. They have been requesting subsequent eligibility applications

with performance. LWIA case managers do not make referrals to programs unless the programs lead to jobs in high demand occupations.

EKCEP - Per LWIB policy, all programs of providers receiving HEA funds are approved 'automatically' and do not have to be formally approved (at a LWIB meeting) by the LWIB.

Bluegrass – They are requesting subsequent eligibility applications. All initial eligibility applications are approved by the LWIB. Per LWIB policy, all providers must attend a training provider orientation.

Barren River – All initial eligibility applications are approved by the LWIB.

****Staff discussed research of ETPL across the nation** and relayed that many states have formal, written state policies.

****The group discussed reciprocal agreements** and was supportive of Kentucky entering into reciprocal agreements with other states.

****The group discussed how providers should submit initial eligibility applications, when the providers have programs offered at satellite campuses.** The group did not come to a consensus, and staff committed to researching the matter and reporting back to the LWIA's.

****The group discussed meeting on a regular basis and decided to meet quarterly.**

****The group discussed recent activity involving CIP Codes.** Craig Holloman agreed to test the update program for the Access database dropdown box (listing CIP Codes) that Mike Rawlings (CWD) created. The update program can best be disseminated with WinZip, and the group agreed that they would check to see if they had WinZip capability and let DTR staff know.

****The group reviewed a rough draft of the revised ETPL application and approved of the application with a couple of additional revisions:**

1. A space to note the number of students calculated for performance will be added to page three of the application.
2. Cost information will be moved to page three of the application.

****DTR Staff informed the group that everyone was to begin asking for *subsequent eligibility applications, with performance information.*** Programs that do not submit both the application and performance information are to have their eligibility removed. Staff also informed the group that programs of providers not receiving HEA funds are required to submit performance information on *initial eligibility* applications.

LWIA staff noted their concern that many providers do not track performance using the formulas WIA requires, nor do they figure performance data for multiple campus locations. The concern is that many providers may lose their eligibility if WIA requirements are strictly enforced. DTR staff agreed to give further consideration to this issue. No conclusion was reached. (Addendum to minutes – incorporated 1/29/04, by request.)

****Staff informed the group that no programs or providers are to be removed from the Access database** – rather, if a program/provider loses its eligibility; then eligibility

status should be noted in the 'comments' section. The group decided to type 'ineligible' beside the name of all programs which have lost their eligibility.

****Staff encouraged the group to begin writing and/or refining local policies.** Staff conveyed that the policies need not be elaborate, but they should be as specific as possible – vague, problematic language should be avoided.